

Serial No. 10/829,256

Attorney Docket No. 26E-008

REMARKS

Claims 1-11 are pending. Claims 10 and 11 are new. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-9 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Aritake patent. The applicants respectfully request that this rejection be withdrawn for the following reasons.

In the conventional method discussed in the background section of the specification, upon the molding of a molded part, long tabs are formed due to tab gates (38) of the sprue gates for injecting molding material into a mold cavity (See Fig. 3). The long tabs must be cut off, which increases the production costs and the production time (see page 2, line 23 to page 3, line 13). The claimed invention avoids that problem.

The method of the present invention includes provision of protrusions in the mold that protrude into the mold cavity. Also, in the step of injecting a molding material, the molding material is injected into the mold cavity through the protrusions, with the sprue gates extending from the upper mold.

By providing the protrusions in the mold, the molded part has depressions (see reference number 84 of the illustrated embodiment) corresponding to the protrusions of the mold (See Figs. 5-7), and the molding material is cut at joints between the sprue gates and the mold cavity. The joints are located in the protrusions of the mold. Therefore, the molded part does not have any projection or long tab that projects from the resultant depressions of the molded part.

Serial No. 10/829,256

Attorney Docket No. 26E-008

The object of the method of the Aritake patent is to form a molded portion at a low temperature while exhibiting good sealing quality and good gripping force to the flange as well as making the color of the molded portion identical to the extruded portion. The Aritake patent is not concerned with tabs projecting from the molded part.

As the Examiner indicates, the Aritake patent shows two gates 25 and 26 in Fig. 3. However, these gates 25 and 26 are designed to inject different materials at different times into different cavities of the mold. One gate is for injecting a polyethylene resin material, and another gate is for injecting a soft TPO material. The mold cavities are adapted to mold an attachment portion 22, a covering lip portion 24, and a sealing portion 23.

Claims 1 and 2 recite that injection of material through the first sprue gates is performed at the same time as the injection through the second sprue gates. The specification of the Aritake patent describes semi-rigid material as being injected into the mold cavity to form an attachment portion. The specification states that "Next, a soft or sponge TPE material is injected into the mold cavity to form a sealing portion..." (see column 3, lines 26-34). The word "Next" indicates that the injections are not simultaneous. Therefore, the Aritake patent fails to disclose or suggest injection from both first and second pluralities of sprue gates at the same time.

Page 2 of the Official Action indicates that there would be protrusions oppositely-matching the recesses in elements 23 and 24. However, the Aritake patent neither shows nor suggests that the mold has protrusions through which the molding material is injected into the mold cavity to prevent the formation of projections or long tabs in the molded part upon opening the mold. Since the Aritake patent fails to disclose or suggest the claimed protrusions, claims 1 and 2 cannot be rendered obvious by the Aritake patent.

Serial No. 10/829,256

Attorney Docket No. 26E-008


Claims 3-9 depend on claim 1 or claim 2 and are thus considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 2.

Claims 10 and 11 are new. Claims 10 and 11 depend on claims 1 or 2, directly or indirectly. Therefore, claims 10 and 11 are considered to be patentable for the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 2.

If questions relating to patentability remain, the examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone.

If there are any problems with the payment of fees, please charge any underpayments and credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-1147.

Respectfully submitted,


James E. Barlow
Reg. No. 32,377

Posz Law Group, PLC
12040 South Lakes Drive, Suite 101
Reston, VA 20191
Phone 703-707-9110
Fax 703-707-9112
Customer No. 23400